

PATENT
Atty. Dkt. No. WEAT/0042

REMARKS

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

This is intended as a full and complete response to the Final Office Action dated January 19, 2006, having a shortened statutory period for response set to expire on April 19, 2006. Please reconsider the claims pending in the application for reasons discussed below.

Claims 1-45, 49-53, and 55 remain pending in the application after entry of this response. Claim 47 has been cancelled without prejudice. Claims 1, 22, 27, 30-41, 49, and 50 have been amended. No new matter has been added by the amendments.

Claims 1-45, 47, 49-53, and 55 stand rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Chapman* (U.S. Pat. No. 5,504,491), *Tubel* (U.S. Pat. No. 5,730,291), *Yamazaki* (U.S. Pat. No. 6,867,752) in view of *Millheim* (U.S. Pat. No. 4,794,534).

Regarding claim 1 and its dependents, none of the cited references teach, suggest, or disclose establishing an Internet connection between a drilling rig and an offsite location, as recited in amended claim 1. *Tubel* discloses an automated downhole control system for production of a completed offshore well. *Chapman* discloses a GPS system for emergency response personnel. *Yamazaki* discloses a wireless head mount display (HMD) unit for e-mail and browsing the Internet. *Millheim* discloses a remote monitoring/simulation system and a communication system providing real time communication to the remote system for drilling analysis. None of *Tubel*, *Chapman*, and *Millheim* even mentions the Internet. *Yamazaki* does not mention drilling rigs. Therefore, the cited references, either alone or in combination, do not render claim 1 and its dependents obvious.

Regarding claims 27, 42, and their dependents, none of the cited references teach, suggest, or disclose either a portable communications attachment attached to a hardhat and comprising an external camera, as recited in amended claim 27, or "securing a communications attachment having an external camera to an on-site personnel," as recited in amended claim 42. Neither *Tubel* nor *Chapman* mentions cameras. *Yamazaki* discloses an internal camera for tracking eye movements and *Millheim* discloses placing cameras around the wellsite (col. 5, lines 29-31). Therefore,

BEST AVAILABLE COPYPATENT
Atty. Dkt. No. WEAT/0042


the cited references, either alone or in combination, do not render claims 27, 42, and their dependents obvious.

Regarding motivation to combine, the Examiner cites improving simulation as a motivation to combine. None of *Tubel*, *Chapman*, and *Yamazaki* discloses anything that would improve *Millheim*'s system for relaying data from a drilling rig to a remote computer simulator. As discussed in the last response (and incorporated herein by reference), *Tubel*'s primary objective is an automated downhole control system. *Chapman*'s system provides only GPS information. *Yamazaki*'s unit only allows for data entry by a user. It does not provide any inputs for sensors of any kind.

The secondary references made of record are noted. However, it is believed that the secondary references are no more pertinent to the Applicant's disclosure than the primary references cited in the Final Office Action. Therefore, Applicant believes that a detailed discussion of the secondary references is not necessary for a full and complete response to this Final Office Action.

In conclusion, the references cited by the Examiner, alone or in combination, do not teach, show, or suggest the invention as claimed. Having addressed all issues set out in the Final Office Action, Applicant respectfully submits that the claims are in condition for allowance and respectfully request that the claims be allowed.

Respectfully submitted,



William B. Patterson
Registration No. 34,102
PATTERSON & SHERIDAN, L.L.P.
3040 Post Oak Blvd. Suite 1500
Houston, TX 77056
Telephone: (713) 623-4844
Facsimile: (713) 623-4846
Attorney for Applicant(s)